

**Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary**

Application No.

10/058,374

Applicant(s)

ADACHI ET AL.

Examiner

Michael I Poe

Art Unit

1732

**All Participants:**(1) Michael I Poe (Examiner).(2) Linda Saltiel (Applicant's attorney).**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 6 July 2004**Time:** 10:00 am**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*None specifically*

Claims discussed:

*1-12*

Prior art documents discussed:

*None specifically***Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet***Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: On July 1, 2004, the examiner called the applicant's attorney to discuss proposed amendments that would place the application in condition for allowance. The examiner stipulated that, although the applicant's arguments in the 3rd paragraph of page 10 of the applicant's response filed June 14, 2004 were found persuasive by the examiner, the claims as currently written were not commensurate with the applicant's arguments. Specifically, the claims as currently written do not require that cutting occurs between the side(s) of the cutting blade and the respective edge(s) of the anvil groove when the side(s) of the cutting blade is pressed against the edge(s) of the anvil groove. In order to make the claims commensurate with the applicant's arguments, the examiner proposed amending the claims to specify that cutting occurs between the side(s) of the cutting blade and the respective edge(s) of the anvil groove. The examiner further proposed changing the title so that it better reflected the allowable invention. Finally, the examiner proposed canceling non-elected claims 7-12 without prejudice. On July 6, 2004, the applicant's attorney approved the proposed changes and authorized the examiner to proceed with the changes via Examiner's Amendment. Refer to the Examiner's Amendment for a complete listing of changes.